Coordinated Compliance Review
Special Education Self-Review
2002-2003

GENERAL INSTRUCTIONS

Table of Contents

D R A F T

I. Background and Introduction

The purpose of the Coordinated Compliance Review (CCR) Special Education Self-Review (SESR) is threefold:

1. to ensure that the local education agencies (LEAs) are providing appropriate supervision and monitoring of their special education programs and services

2. to determine the educational benefit students receive in district special education programs

3. to provide information to the California Department of Education (CDE) regarding key compliance questions based on the use of CDE-specified tools and assessment methodologies

The total items used to measure compliance in the 2002-03 SESR have been reduced and Policy and Procedure items have been added.

The intent of the SESR review was to simplify it as much as possible. All of the record reviews, educational benefit and Individualized Education Program (IEP) implementation can be completed with the **same 10 student records at each site.**

The 2002-2003 Self-Reviews have made a paradigm shift from previous years. In the past CCRs and SESRs focus was primarily on procedural guarantees. The 2002-03 reviews also look at procedural guarantees, but also at how students progress from special education instruction.

The 2002-03 Self-Review also makes it a priority to obtain parent concerns for follow up and it incorporates high frequency items that were found noncompliant during the CDE verification reviews across the state.

The CCR SESR is also intended to be used in conjunction with other CCR Self-Review tools and activities to assist district staff to achieve an overall assessment of services to children.

II. CCR Self-Review Questions

The CCR SESR process for 2002-2003 is designed to answer five broad questions:

1. Does the district provide services that result in educational benefit using the Rowley standard?

2. Does the district provide services that result in educational benefit as measured by special education goals and Key Performance Indicators (KPI)?

3. Does the district comply with procedural guarantees that are known to be frequent noncompliance items in other districts?

4. Does the district fulfill its responsibilities as the district of residence when its students are served by other districts and programs?

5. Does the Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA), of which the district is a part, fulfill its responsibilities for monitoring the procedural elements of the local plan?

III. Overview

A. Developing a SESR Monitoring Plan

1. Data Review - LEAs are responsible for obtaining a copy of their Special Education Data reports from the CDE web site and completing an analysis of the district's 8 data measures

California Department of Education
Special Education Division

Coordinated Compliance Review
Special Education Self-Review (SESR)
October 2002

D R A F T

(KPI) and identify any measures that do not fall in the same pattern of comparable districts. Any measures that require attention will be included in the district's Monitoring Plan.

2. Parent Input - The district is to design the parent input portion of the Self-Review with district staff, the Community Advisory Committee (CAC) members, local Family Resource Centers (FRC), or with their regional Parent Training and information centers.

There are three methods of obtaining parent input, these are by using a parent input session, a focus group, or by disseminating and collecting a parent survey. The same questions will be used for each activity.

The results of the data review and the information collected from the parent process are then compiled into the district's proposed **Special Education Self-Review Monitoring Plan** that is to be submitted to the CDE consultant for approval.

B. SESR Activities

1. Record Review - The 2002-03 SESR has combined frequent items found noncompliant in districts that relate to KPI, policies and procedures and procedural guarantees as this year's instrument to be used in record reviews.

    The 2002-03 SESR requires that 10 IEPs at each school site and sites providing services that may not be a district site (Nonpublic Schools [NPS], County Office of Education [COE], Charter Schools) be reviewed for compliance using the newly revised CCR SESR **Special Education Self-Review Core Record Review Items form** and any **data Report items (1-8) that may be required to complete the district's Monitoring Plan**. Ten Individualized Family Service Plans (IFSP) and 10 preschools must be reviewed at the district level. An additional 5 records from the COE must be reviewed at each district site where the COE operates Special Education classes.

    a. Educational Benefit - A change in the 2002-03 Self-Reviews from previous reviews looks at the issue of students obtaining an educational benefit from their special education program and services

    b. Core and other record review items - the 2002-03 SESR has combined frequent items found noncompliant in districts that relate to KPIs, policies and procedures and procedural guarantees as this year's instrument to be used in record reviews.

        Other Student record reviews – The monitoring plan designed by the district and the parent professional team may also require that student records be reviewed with a particular focus that was identified as required follow-up to potential areas of concern.

    c. IEP implementation - The districts are responsible for: 1) selecting 10 student records for review; 2) use the criteria established by CDE; 3) conduct interviews with parents and staff; and collect documentation about the provision of services;

2. Policy and Procedures -   The district is responsible for reviewing their policies and procedures with the Core Policy and Procedures items provided by the CDE.

3. Monitoring Implementation of the Local Plan - EC § 56195.7 requires written agreements for multi-district SELPA that there are ongoing reviews of programs and that there is a mechanism in place for correcting any identified problems. These procedures must be described.

4. Class Size Reduction - Districts are required to report any affect class size reduction

California Department of Education
Special Education Division

Coordinated Compliance Review
Special Education Self-Review (SESR)
October 2002

DRAFT

C. Findings and Corrective Actions

1. Identifying noncompliance - During the LEA's Self-Review process items will be found noncompliant. These will be summarized into an electronic form called the Master Noncompliance Worksheet (SESR form # 5)

2. Developing Corrective Actions - Upon coming across findings of noncompliance, the LEA must provide appropriate corrective actions that will correct the area of noncompliance in a timely manner. Corrective Actions require four components:

    a. a review/revision of policies and procedures
    b. dissemination of policies and procedures
    c. training of staff regarding the policies and procedures
    d. six month, or one year follow-up to ensure compliance has been maintained.

3. Reporting to the CDE - Various electronic forms are provided on the web site at http://www.cde.ca.gov/spbranch/sed/ccr_sr_02/ccrsrdoc.htm. There are also district and site certification pages that must also be submitted with required attachments. A list of required documents has been included in the text of this document.

IV. Developing a Special Education Self-Review Monitoring Plan

A. Parent Input into the Self-Review Process

The 2002-03 SESR requires that a district design the method for gaining parent input with their local CAC and Parent Training and Information Center (PTI), or a FRC member. Other local parent groups with parents of special education students may also be involved.

There are three potential methods for obtaining information for the SESR. These are:

1. Focus Group - Parent/guardian Focus Groups are one activity used by the CDE when reviewing local school districts to ensure compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and accompanying state and federal laws and regulations.

    Samples of invitations, flyers, etc. are available on the SED web site at http://www.cde.ca.gov/spbranch/sed/ccr_sr_02/ccrsrdoc.htm.

    A parent focus group meeting must be held for every 1000 enrolled special education students who reside in the LEA. (Example for 1000 students enrolled, then one focus group is required. If 2000 students are enrolled, then two parent focus group meetings are required.

    If the district has home language surveys that indicate that 25% of their special education population has a designated language other than English, the district shall conduct a focus group with interpreters for just that language group as well as another focus group for English speakers.

    The parent focus group meeting will use the questions that are provided by the CDE and can use the same note-taking forms used by CDE for the parent focus group meetings that are located at http://www.cde.ca.gov/spbranch/sed/ccr_sr_02/ccrsrdoc.htm. Other materials previously used by CDE for parent focus group meetings are also provided at this same web site.

    Note: All areas of concern/noncompliance will be reviewed and addressed in the district's monitoring plan that is developed with district staff and a parent professional team (SESR form # 12).

DRAFT

2. Parent Input Meeting - A parent input meeting differs from a focus group because you send out invitations to all parents/guardians of special education students in the district.

    A parent meeting must be held for every 1000 enrolled special education students who reside in the LEA. (Example for 1000 students enrolled, then one parent meeting is required. If 2000 students are enrolled, then two parent input meetings are required. Each parent input meeting must have 15 participants.

    If the district has home language surveys that indicate that 25% of their special education population has a designated language other than English, the district shall conduct a parent input meeting with interpreters for just that language group as well as another parent input meeting for English speakers.

    The parent input meeting will also use the same questions that are provided by the CDE for focus groups and can use the same note-taking forms used for the parent focus group meetings that are located at
    http://www.cde.ca.gov/spbranch/sed/ccr_sr_02/ccrsrdoc.htm.   Materials previously by CDE for parent focus group meetings are also provided at this same web site.

    Information on local PTI and FRC can be found on the following web site:
    http://www.cde.ca.gov/spbranch/sed/caprntorg.htm.

3. Surveys - The CDE has provided a sample survey at the above mentioned site. Surveys can be used in conjunction with a focus group, or a parent input meeting. It is expected that if surveys are used, at least **20%** will be returned and used for analysis.
    Note: All areas of concern/noncompliance will be reviewed and addressed in the district' monitoring plan that is developed with district staff and a parent professional team.

B. Review of District Data Report

Data reports may be obtained at http://www.cde.ca.gov/spbranch/sed/datarpts/index.htm.

1. Instructions - District staff review the 8 referenced data measures. There is an explanation as to how these measures are calculated and what are the comparable districts used to determine the measures on the above web site.

    District staff must discuss each data point and make a determination if the data is accurate, and if not, can the district produce other alternative data that contradicts the data obtained in the data report. If the district used other data, they must include this information when they submit their Monitoring Plan to the CDE.

    If a discrepancy exists for the following then a follow up review must be included in the monitoring plan. The CDE has provided record review forms for each data measure to be used by the LEA if the following occurs:

    ✓ KPI 1 (% of students receiving SE services) - If the district is plus or minus 2%,or more, as compared to comparable districts, then the district is required to investigate why there is a discrepancy by using the KPI record review form, for this measurement, located on the web site.
    ✓ KPI 2 (Disparity) -   If the district is plus or minus 2%, or more, as compared to comparable districts, then the district is required to investigate why there is a discrepancy by using the KPI record review form, for this measurement, located on the web site.
    ✓ KPI 3a (% of students removed 20 % or less) - If greater than comparable districts, it does not have to be investigated. If 2% less than comparable districts, then the district is required to investigate why there is a discrepancy by using the KPI record review form, for this measurement, located on the web site.

California Department of Education
Special Education Division

Coordinated Compliance Review
Special Education Self-Review (SESR)
October 2002

D R A F T

✓ KPI 3b (% of students receiving SE services removed 80% or more) If the district's score is greater than comparable districts, then don't investigate, if 2% or more less than comparable districts, then the district is required to investigate why there is a discrepancy by using the KPI record review form, for this measurement, located on the web site.

✓ KPI 4 (% of students who returned to GE) - If the district has a score greater than comparable districts, then don't investigate. If the district is 2% or more below comparable districts, then the district is required to investigate why there is a discrepancy by using the KPI record review form, for this measurement, located on the web site.

✓ KPI 5 (% of exited students who graduated) - If the district has a score greater than comparable districts, then don't investigate. If the district is 2% or more below comparable districts, then the district is required to investigate why there is a discrepancy by using the KPI record review form, for this measurement, located on the web site.

✓ KPI 6 (% of students who dropped out) - If the district is less than comparable districts, then don't investigate, if the district is 2% or more than comparable districts, then the district is required to investigate why there is a discrepancy by using the KPI record review form, for this measurement, located on the web site.

✓ KPI 7 (% of SE students who participate in STAR) - If the district has a score higher than the district, then don't investigate. If the district is 2% or more below comparable districts, then the district is required to investigate why there is a discrepancy by using the KPI record review form, for this measurement, located on the web site.

✓ KPI 8 (Mean scale score of SE students who took the STAR) - If the district has a score higher than the district, then don't investigate. If the district is 2% or more below comparable districts, then the district is required to investigate why there is a discrepancy by using the KPI record review form, for this measurement, located on the web site. (See appendix page 35 for investigation criteria)

Note: Any measure that requires follow up must be listed in the district's monitoring plan.

C. Developing a Special Education Self-Review Monitoring Plan

A monitoring plan is the district's investigation plan to be used to investigate whether the issues raised during the district's data review were valid concerns and to address any concerns raised from the parent input activities.

1. Parent Input - Describe who participated, how information was recorded and what issues of concern were brought out from the parent input, focus group, or parent surveys.

    Go to the SESR 2002-03 Self-Review Monitoring Plan (SESR form # 12) located on the web site. Fill out the portion that asks: 1) who participated; 2) How information was collected and recorded; 3) What issues were found to be troublesome from the parent input activities. (attach any additional sheets you may require)

2. Data Review - Describe the data review process, who participated, how the data was reviewed from the district's Data Report and whether district staff determined that the data was valid. If the staff determined that the data was not valid, then what data did they present to show the difference? (Attach any additional sheets you require.)

    Any data measures that reports the percentage of difference as described in the **Data Review** section of this manual must be listed as an area of concern and investigated.

3. Investigation Plan - When considering the issues raised from the parent input activities and the data reviews, fill out the portion of the monitoring plan labeled investigation plan. You may use additional sheets as necessary as you describe how you are going to investigate the issues of concern.

DRAFT

✓ Record reviews - Describe how you will use the record reviews to investigate the areas of concern, how many records you plan to review to determine a finding, who will review records and what you will be looking for during the record reviews.
✓ Interviews - Describe how you will use the interviews to investigate the areas of concern, how many interviews you plan to complete to determine a finding, who will conduct the interviews, what you will be looking for during the interviews, and who you plan to interview. You must also attach a list of questions you will use during the interviews to the monitoring plan you submit for CDE review.
✓ Policies and Procedures - Describe what policies and procedures you will review, who will review the policies and procedures and what you will be looking for during the policies and procedures review.
✓ Other documentation - Describe what you want to find out and where you think you may find the information you are looking for.
✓ Additional Information - Describe anything else you think the CDE consultant should know about your investigation plan that would be helpful for approval.

4. Submission of the monitoring plan - Submit the completed monitoring plan with any pertinent attachments (interview questions, etc) to the FMTA unit Manager assigned to your geographical area. It is anticipated that the consultant assigned to your area will be able to provide approval, or technical assistance, for your plan within two to four weeks, so the district can then conduct their Self-Review investigation.

V. Monitoring Activities

A. Student Record Reviews

The record review, educational benefit analysis and follow up on IEP implementation can be completed with the same 10 records at each site.

1. Educational Benefit - The 2002-03 SESR's focus is on procedural safeguards and educational benefit. The U.S. Supreme Court determined educational benefit in 1982 in the case of the Board of Education V. Rowley. This case established that FAPE required "personalized instruction with sufficient supportive services to permit the child to benefit from instruction." The court further stated that there must be access to specialized instruction and related services that are individually designed to provide educational benefit. Justice Rhenquist in part stated that such instructions… shall be reasonably calculated to enable the child to achieve passing marks and advance grade to grade.

   Special Education has been clearly defined in 34 CFR § 300.26(b)(3)(ii) which states in part "To ensure access of the child to the general curriculum, so that he or she can meet the educational standards within the jurisdiction of the public agency that apply to all children."

   How to Determine Educational Benefit

   The LEA is to review 5 student records for the last three years, starting with the triennial assessments and the following 3 years of IEPs. If there are fewer than three since the triennial, also review those developed before the triennial assessment that are most current.

   For each school year IEP list the student's present levels of performance in all areas, all of the pupil's goals for all areas, the services provided (including placement), and whether progress was made. Record this information on flip charts for each school year similar to the example on the next page. Also record your findings on the Educational Benefit Review Student Summary Form (yes/no).

DRAFT

School Year _____

Present Level of Performance (Needs)	Plus or Minus	Goals/ Objectives	Plus or Minus	Services	Plus or Minus	Student Progress	Plus or Minus

Lay out each chart next to one another by school year.

Look at your lists and with a colored marker circle all of the students needs that are addressed in the assessments and on the IEPs. See the slide show as an example on the web site.

With the same marker draw a line from each need to the goal/objective that addresses that need.   With a different colored marker circle any need that was not addressed by a goal/objective.   If a goal/objective did not address a certain educational need, then you should consider marking this as noncompliant.

Now draw a line from each need and goal/objective to the services provided with the original marker.   Now circle any need, or goal/objective listed that is not addressed by a needed service. If there should have been a service, but it was not provided, consider marking this area as noncompliant.

Look at the progress statements made about the student in the assessments, or IEP and determine if there was growth, regression, or no change.

Multi- year analysis - Go across and down and compare all 3 IEPs consecutively by year to determine: 1) if the present levels of performance have improved; 2) if the goals/objectives have changed to more, or less in complexity; 3) if the services provided support the student's goals and objectives, and 4) whether the student made progress on each goal and objective, or not. In the plus and minus columns put a plus, for growth, a minus for less and a zero if no change.

You must be able to answer the following key discussion questions:

▪ Is the assessment complete and identifies the student's needs? (34 CFR 300.532, 34 CFR 300.533)
▪ Does the present performance include all of the needs identified in the assessment? (34 CFR 300.347(a)(1)(i)-(ii)
▪ Are all of the student's educational needs addressed by appropriate goals and objectives? (34 CFR 300.347(a)(2)(i)-(ii))
▪ Do the services support the goals and objectives? (34 CFR 347(a)(3)(i)-(ii)-(iii)
▪ Did the student make yearly progress? (34 CFR 300.343(c)(2)(i)

If the student did not make progress:

▪ Were the goals and objectives changed in the next IEP to assist the student to make progress?
▪ Were the services changed in the next IEP to assist the student to make progress?
▪ Were sufficient services provided (Rowley) to ensure that the student would make progress? (34 CFR 300.347(a)(3)(i)-(iii))
▪ To assess for overall compliance, considering the answers in each of the above, was the IEP reasonably calculated to result in educational benefit? (5 CCR 3040 (c) &Rowley)

DRAFT

Fill out the Educational Benefit Review Summary Form marking yes/no to show whether the IEP was reasonably calculated (SESR Form # 3), then record this information into the 2002-03 SESR Educational Benefit Analysis sheet (SESR Form # 11).

2. Core Review and other Record Review Items - LEA sites are responsible for:

✓ Identifying all of the LEAs, charter schools county operated programs and nonpublic schools (NPS) who serve children who are residents of the district
✓ Identifying teams who will be responsible for reviewing student records
✓ Pulling a sample of 10 student records at each LEA, district site, charter school, or NPS (If fewer than 10 records are available at a site, pull all of those that are available)
✓ Students from district of residence who are served by COEs at least 10 records must be pulled at each COE operated site and 5 at each district sites where COE classes are housed
✓ Reviewing records using the CCRSESR Special Education Self-Review Core Record Review Items form, 10 IFSPs using the Infant and Toddler record review form and 10 IEPs for preschoolers using the SESR – Student record Review Preschool list of items.
✓ Findings of noncompliance and corrective action plans are to be summarized by student, by site and for the district as a whole
✓ These findings along with evidence of correction are forwarded to CDE as part of the SESR process in the SESR 2002-03 Master Noncompliant Findings worksheet (SESR Form # 5)
✓ Enter information about each site where records are reviewed into the 2002-03 SESR Master Site list (SESR Form # 7)
✓ Enter information about each student whose record was reviewed into 2002-03 Master Student list (SESR Form # 8)

The forms are structured to assist the reader in reviewing the records. Items for each form have been drawn from a much larger master set of items. Items for each form have been selected because they are likely to be found in a student record and so that the vast majority of the items apply to the students being reviewed. The form includes several types of information to assist the reviewer in making a determination of compliance or noncompliance: a compliance test drawn from federal or state law and regulation, a compliance standard, guidance about where the information might be found, and legal references in case there is some question about meaning or interpretation.

There are two types of items contained in the form – root items and sub items. In some cases, the root item will be the only part assessed for compliance. In other cases, the sub item(s) will be assessed.   In most cases, however, the sub items are included to assist the reviewer to conduct a more complete assessment of the item.

There are some general rules to use when reviewing a record:

✓ Use the most recent assessment plan, IEP, notices, consents etc. for conducting the review. Both requirements and forms have changed over time so it is important to assess the most recent documentation using the most current requirements.
✓ There are three ways to mark each item: Being "Compliant" (the record complies with the item), "Non Compliant" (the record does not comply with the item), or "Not applicable" (the item does not apply to the particular record being reviewed). If there is a question, the forms include some guidance about the minimum compliance standards as well as references to state and federal law and regulation. **It is important to note that reviewers should always record why they marked any item either noncompliant or not applicable.** The notations regarding findings of noncompliance form the basis for

California Department of Education
Special Education Division

Coordinated Compliance Review
Special Education Self-Review (SESR)
October 2002

DRAFT

the finding statement that the reviewer will need to record on the summary of noncompliance findings. Notations regarding "not applicable" items are essential to determining whether the reviewer understood the requirement correctly. Items have been reviewed carefully to ensure that they apply to the vast majority of students. As a result, the reviewer needs to make a careful note of why they think the item does not apply

3. IEP Implementation - See the instructions under IEP implementation section C below. It is important to note the IEP implementation activity has a student record component to it. You can use the same 10 student records per site to complete this activity.

B. Policies and Procedures

The 2002-03 SESR requires districts to review policies using the **Special Education Self-Review Core Policy and Procedure Review Items form** and policy and procedures items identified in the Monitoring Plan*. As the LEA staff review policies* make sure that any noncompliant items are entered in the SESR 2002-03 Policies and Procedures Noncompliant items worksheet (SESR form # 10)

C. IEP Implementation and Service Data

The overall purposes of the data collection about the implementation of IEPs are: 1) to report on the status of services contained in the IEP; and 2) to ensure that students receive all of the services that are contained in the IEP, as described in the IEP. Failure to implement the IEP is the most frequent finding of noncompliance identified through the complaint process.

1. Implementation of IEPs - Verification of the implementation of IEPs involves several activities:

   A. Selection of 10 student records for review. Districts are encouraged to use the same records pulled at the school sites during the educational benefit reviews; the other five records pulled at the site should represent the types of students being educated at that site i.e. 3 LH and 2 SH, etc.
   B. Conducting interviews with parents and staff using the IEP interview form # 14.
   C. Collecting documentation about the provision of services;
   D. Summarizing provision/nonprovision of services;
   E. Determining noncompliance findings and preparing corrective actions;
   F. Summarizing data on the IEP Summary Sheets (SESR form # 13) and on the CCRSESR 2002-03Services Data Worksheet (SESR Form Number 6).
   G. Summarizing data on the SESR 2002-03 Master Noncompliant Findings worksheet - as appropriate if noncompliance is found (SESR form # 5).

2. Reviewing the IEP: The District staff should review the IEP and take special note of:

   ✓ the status and completeness of the IEP
   ✓ information about related services/designated instruction and services (DIS)
   ✓ supplementary aids and services
   ✓ participation in academic and non-academic and extra-curricular activities with the general school population
   ✓ documentation (for students 16 years of age or older) that 1)the IEP meeting notice included transition planning as one of the purposes of the meeting and 2) that the student was invited to attend the meeting
   ✓ This information will be used to complete both individual student and districtwide data summaries. The staff person will also want to draw on this information in interviews with parents, and regular and special education staff. To the maximum extent possible, interviews should be conducted independently (e.g., staff working with the same child

DRAFT

should be interviewed separately). Information about the student's IEP should be recorded on the *Individual IEP Summary Form*

3. Parent and Staff Interviews - Based on the records selected, staff should arrange to conduct interviews about the implementation of the IEP. At a minimum this should include the special education teacher, the regular education teacher, related service providers and the parent. The purpose of the interview is to determine whether services are provided according to the IEP. The IEP is to be taken very literally – if it says 1 time per week for one half hour, staff should consider that the minimum amount of service to be expected. The following questions are to be used to assist staff to assess full implementation of the IEP for each student:

- ✓ What related services and other services are being provided for _____ currently?
- ✓ How often does _____ receive this service?
- ✓ For how long (30 minutes, 60 minutes) are the services provided? _____
- ✓ Where does _____ receive the services (in his/her classroom, speech room, clinic, at home) _____ (location)?
- ✓ Are all services written on the IEP provided_____?
- ✓ How do you know services are provided according to the IEP? What type of documentation is available to ensure services are provided?
- ✓ (Special Question for Parents of Children who are 16+ years of age): Were you notified that the IEP team meeting would include discussion of transition from school to post-school activities? Who were you told would attend? What were you informed would be discussed?
- ✓ The same questions are used for parents and staff. Staff is urged to draw on their knowledge of the IEP to probe for information that clarifies questions that may arise. An **IEP Interview Form** for recording interview responses is provided on the web site.

Collecting documentation and analyzing results. Staff should secure or arrange to receive any documentation about service delivery since the beginning of the school year or since the last IEP team meeting (whichever is most recent), particularly if there are any discrepancies in the interview findings. This documentation might include provider service logs, student attendance records, staff attendance records, contractor billing records, etc. The district should also follow-up on any discrepancies discovered in the interviews.

Information about each individual student should be collected and analyzed. This information should be used to certify whether each service was provided as identified in the IEP, or not provided as identified in the IEP on the **Individual IEP Summary Form SESR form # 13**. A service should be considered *provided* as identified on the most recent IEP if the service was delivered exactly as described on the IEP, unless there is documentation that the student was absent. If staff was absent due to illness, etc., look for evidence that a substitute provider was made available, or that the service was made-up by the staff person who normally provides the service. A service should be considered *not provided* as identified on the most recent IEP if there is documentation from interviews, staff service logs or some other source that services were not provided on all of the scheduled days, for the amount of time specified in the IEP, unless there is documentation that the student was absent. It is important to note that there is a difference between an allegation and evidence in determining whether a service was provided or not. Allegations that a service was not provided discovered through the interview process should be corroborated through some form of evidence (staff or student attendance records, etc.)

Information from all of the 10 records used for IEP Implementation Data Collection must be summarized in *the **CCR SESR 2002-03 IEP – Services Data worksheet** (SESR From # 6)*and, as appropriate, the ***SESR 2003-03 Master Noncompliant Findings worksheet (SESR Form # 5).*** If noncompliance is found*.

California Department of Education
Special Education Division

Coordinated Compliance Review
Special Education Self-Review (SESR)
October 2002

D R A F T

D. Monitoring the Local Plan

EC § 56195.7 requires in multiple district SELPAs that agreements be in place that within a SELPA that ensures programs will be monitored for compliance with State and federal regulations. The LEA must provide a copy of the agreements and answer several questions about the monitoring process the SELPA provides.   This information is provided in the SESR 2002-03 Monitoring the Implementation of the Local Plan (SESR Form #4).

E. Class Size Reduction

Purpose: To meet requirements: Office for Civil Rights (OCR), Region IX Voluntary Resolution Plan-Docket # 09-98-1025

- ✓ CDE must require a standard for adequate space for students with disabilities in the 2002-2003 CCR Self-Review document.
- ✓ CDE will request that SELPA administrators and SEACO conduct a survey to identify the impact that CSR has had on students with disabilities. (Negotiated with SELPA and SEACO to determine the dates that survey will be collated and returned to CDE for transmission to OCR).

General Approach: As part of the self-review, each site needs to complete a facilities document in which each site reports the age level of the program (elementary, secondary, other), the number of pupils, the square footage and indication, as appropriate, if the program is operated by the COE (on that site). The reporting form provides each site and district with the facilities standards described in Education Code 17047 (Special Day Class and Resource Specialist Program Facilities; Allowable New Building Area). CDE also provides room for comments recognizing that square footage may vary from site to site and district to district taking into account IEP implementation and provision of FAPE in the Least Restrictive Environment.

DRAFT

Education Code Standards for New or Leased Facilities EC § 17047

Disability Types-Special Day Classes and Resource Specialist Programs	Grade Level Facility Standards	# Of Pupils per Classroom Standards	Classroom Size (Sq.Ft.) Standard
Specific Learning Disability	All	12	1080
Mildly Mentally Retarded	All	12	1080
Severe Disorder of Language	All	10	1080
Deaf & Hard of Hearing	All	10	1080
Visually Impaired	All	10	1330 (1080 + 250 storage)
Orthopedic or Other Health Impaired	All	12	2000 (1080 + 400 toilets + 250 storage + 270 daily living skills + 3000 therapy + 750 therapy per addn'l classroom.
Autistic	All	6	1160 (1080 + 80 toilets)
Emotionally Disturbed	All	6	1160 (1080 + 80 toilets)
Severely Mentally Retarded	Elem.	12	1750 (1080 + 400 toilets + 270 daily living skills)
Severely Mentally Retarded	Secondary	12	2150 (1080 + 400 toilets + 270 daily living skills + 400 vocational)
Developmentally Disabled	All	10	2000 (1080 + 400 toilets + 250 storage + 270 daily living skills + 3000 therapy ** + 750 per add'l CR)
Deaf/blind, Multi-Handicapped	All	5	1400 (1080 + 200 storage + 150 toilets)
Resource Specialist Program		Note: RSP program limited to 28 pupils per qualified staff.	240 (1-8 pupils); 480 (9-28 pupils); 720 (29-37pupils); 960 (38-56 pupils); 1200 (57-65 pupils); 1440 (66-85 pupils)

General Instructions

1. Review the standards;
2. Determine which classrooms are used for groups of students with IEPs (generally used for Special Day Class and Resource Specialist Program) for one, or more periods of the day;
3. For each classroom identified, determine the actual classroom square footage provided, the population who uses the space, the grade level of the students, the largest number of pupils who use the space at one time;
4. Determine whether the space is an existing facility, leased facility, or new construction as of January 1, 1998.
5. Indicate whether the space is occupied by a SELPA, or COE operated program;
6. Enter the information related for each classroom into the form located at the SED web site.

California Department of Education
Special Education Division

Coordinated Compliance Review
Special Education Self-Review (SESR)
October 2002

DRAFT

Note: This does not apply to spaces used by regular education students that may include students with IEPs.

The *2002-03 SESR Facilities Data worksheet* (*SESR Form* # 9)as been provided for the district to aggregate and examine facilities district-wide for students with disabilities. This data will be reviewed by CDE and forwarded (copy) to OCR, Region IX, as part of Voluntary Resolution Plan docket Number 09-98-1025.

VI. Findings, Corrective Actions and Reporting

A. Record Review

During record reviews, if a reviewer finds noncompliance, then a four part corrective action plan. Entered with the item of noncompliance into the 2002-03 Master Noncompliant Findings Worksheet along with the four part corrective action and appropriate required due dates.

B. IEP Implementation

If the reviewer discovers an instance where a student has not received services as specified in the IEP, a finding of noncompliance must be made and a corrective action plan must be developed and implemented. To correct a finding of noncompliance regarding the provision of service, the district must submit documentation that the student received all of the services identified on the IEP, exactly as stated on the IEP, no less than six months from the finding of noncompliance. Thus, if a finding of noncompliance is made on January 2, 2003, then on June 2, 2003 the LEA must submit evidence to the CDE that all of the make-up and regular services were provided as specified in the IEP during the previous 5 ½ - 6 months. These findings and corrective actions should be listed in the SESR 2002-03 Master Noncompliant Findings worksheet. (SESR Form 5)

There are two tests to determine if the failure to implement IEPs is systemic in nature: 1) 10% of the students who receive a particular service (ie. Speech) do not receive that service as written in their IEP and, 2) 10% of the students whose IEPs were reviewed did not receive one or more services as written in their IEP.

C. Corrective Actions

In addition to preparing corrective actions for individual students, the LEA must prepare and implement a corrective action plan regarding their oversight of the implementation of IEPs. The corrective action must detail how the district will provide oversight and must submit evidence to the CDE that:

- ✓ all students received all of the services and/or
- ✓ that the district monitoring system has identified and corrected all instances of failure to provide services.

These findings and corrective actions are listed in *SESR 2002-03 Master Noncompliant Findings worksheet.(SESR Form # 5)*

D. Making Findings of Noncompliance

1. All sites where student records are reviewed must be entered into the 2002-03 SESR Master Site List (SESR Form # 7)

2. Enter information about each student whose record was reviewed into the 2002-03 Master Student List (SESR Form # 8)

3. For every student listed in the Master Student List, a summary of noncompliant findings must be completed. On this form, the reviewer records identifying information about the student

California Department of Education
Special Education Division

Coordinated Compliance Review
Special Education Self-Review (SESR)
October 2002

D R A F T

and the forms used to review the records. The form asks the reviewer to record two things: the item number of the noncompliant item and a finding (why the reviewer found the item noncompliant). It is very important that reviewers be clear in their finding statements, as this provides the key to what needs to be corrected. The reviewer does not need to restate the compliance test – the item number helps both the district and the state to know which test was not met

4. All of the findings of noncompliance for each student must be summarized and entered into the Master Noncompliant worksheet. If no noncompliance was found for a student that student should be listed in the Master 2002-03 Master Student List (SESR Form # 8) along with the notation that all items were found compliant.

    See example below:

District of Service CDS Code	Site CDS Code	Student ID No.	Item No.	Noncompliant Finding	Corrective Actions	Due Date	Evidence	Date Cleared
2222222	Jones, J.	333-33-3333	3-4-1.2	IEP did not include regular class teacher				
2222222	Jones, J.	333-33-3333	3-2-10	Frequency of speech therapy not included in IEP				
2222222	Jones, J.	333-33-3333	3-2-8	IEP did not contain statement regarding student participation in statewide or district assessments				

5. Site Level Systemic Noncompliance - An analysis of the number of times that a specific item is found noncompliant must be conducted. If an item is found noncompliant for 10%, or more of the records (2 out of 10), then that item should be considered systemic for that site

6. District Level Systemic Noncompliance - The district is also responsible for conducting an analysis by item to identify systemic noncompliance items for the district as a whole. As with the site level, the district must identify all items that are systemically noncompliant. A finding of systemic noncompliance must be made if 10%, or more of the students who were assessed on that item were noncompliant.

    Note: Items found noncompliant must be entered into the database even if the LEA has corrected it.

E. Corrective Actions

Each finding of noncompliance must be corrected – both at the student and at the site level. If a student's IEP is incomplete or overdue, for example, the district must ensure that a corrective action plan is developed and that the student's IEP is complete and up to date. For findings of systemic noncompliance a site specific and a district specific corrective action plan must be provided.

1. Student Level Corrective Actions - For each noncompliance found for each student you need to correct it, such as not properly identifying, placing, or assessing a student, or not providing services. These types of noncompliance need to be corrected and compensatory services provided if necessary.

    Not all findings of noncompliance at the student level may require a corrective action, such as, failure to meet a timeline maybe important to note at the site, or district level, but can not really be corrected at the student level, if the activity finally occurred. Samples of corrective actions can be found on the web site.

DRAFT

2. Site and District Level Corrective Actions - A systemic corrective action must include the following activities:

- ✓ a review and revision of appropriate policies and procedures
- ✓ dissemination of the policies and procedures to both administrators and staff
- ✓ training for administrators and staff who are involved in the particular activity
- ✓ a six month or one year follow up check to ensure that a random sample of student records (for students who have gone through the formerly noncompliant procedure) do not show any new instances of noncompliance.

It is anticipated that all instances of noncompliance identified through the record reviews, policy reviews and the district's Monitoring Plan will have corrective action plans developed and that the district will provide evidence of correction. **Evidence is the following: 1) consists of written documentation (forms, letters, logs, etc), and/or, statements of direct action/observation; 2) substantiates the statement being made, and 3) when addressing a completed corrective action demonstrates that the noncompliance was corrected.**

Note: A sample table of corrective actions has been provided on SED's web site as examples only; these do not address all possibilities of noncompliance items. They can be accessed at http://www.cde.ca.gov/spbranch/sed/ccr_sr_02/ccrsrdoc.htm along with the appropriate reporting forms**.**

The CDE will review all corrective action plans and will either accept them as written or contact the LEA for required changes.

Districts are required to provide evidence that both student and systemic findings of noncompliance have been corrected. The CDE staff will review evidence submitted by the LEA to determine whether it is sufficient to establish a systemic correction. A sample for a district systemic, site systemic and student noncompliant findings are listed below.

CDS Code	Site CDS Code	Student ID No.	Item No.	Finding	Corrective Actions	Due Date	Evidence	Date Cleared
2222222		1000 District Systemic **See chart on page 23**	3-4-1.2	A review of records substantiate that the district does not consistently include general education teachers in the IEP process	Review and revise policies and procedures. Send policies and procedures to administrators and staff. Conduct mandatory training for all staff. Pull 20 IEPs of students with recent IEP meetings to determine participation of general ed. teacher.		Copy of updated policies and procedures. Copy of cover memo to district staff. Agenda and sign in sheet from training. Summary of results from follow up IEP reviews.	

DRAFT

CDS Code	Site CDS Code	Student ID No.	Item No.	Finding	Corrective Actions	Due Date	Evidence	Date Cleared
2222222	Site Systemic	500 **See chart on page 23**	3-2-10	A review of student records substantiates that IEPs at (school name) do not consistently include the frequency of therapy.	Review and revise policies and procedures. Send policies and procedures to staff. Conduct mandatory training for all therapists. Pull 10 IEPs of students with recent IEP meetings to determine if frequency off services has been recorded.			
2222222	Jones, J.	333-33-3333	4-1-3	Child does not receive occupational therapy as often as required in his IEP.	Reconvene IEPT meeting to determine the amount of compensatory services to be provided and a schedule for delivering those services. Deliver services as determined by the IEPT.		Copy of notes from IEPT meeting and revised IEP as appropriate. A copy of the service log that shows therapy was provided.	

VII. Completing Data Entry Forms

A. General Background and Instructions

These data entry forms are being distributed in Excel because it is easy to use, it is widely available, and because of its compatibility with a wide variety of database programs.

Cell formats. Certain columns in the Excel tables have been formatted as text. These include District names, CDS Code numbers and any Item No. references. This allows CDS codes to retain the zeros at the beginning of some CDS codes. It also allows the item numbers from the record reviews to keep their format (otherwise the item numbers turn into dates)*. **Before you use these worksheets double check to make sure that these columns are formatted as text**. All other columns are formatted as "general."

Single table for all noncompliance findings. All noncompliance findings – individual student findings, site systemic findings, district findings, noncompliance findings resulting from focus group discussions – must be entered into the Noncompliance findings worksheets. Each type of finding is distinguished by a code number and the appropriate CDS code (site vs. district).   These are explained in the Noncompliance Findings worksheet instructions.   Entering all student record findings into a single table enables the district to easily establish both site and district systemic findings.

There are eight data entry forms (worksheets) contained in the Excel File entitled, "CCRSR Data Entry 2002-03." They include

1. CDE SESR 2002-03 Monitoring the Implementation of the Local Plan form (SESR Form # 4)
2. SESR 2002-03 Master Noncompliant Findings worksheet (SESR Form # 5)
3. CCR SESR 2002-03 IEP Services Data worksheet (SESR Form # 6)
4. 2002-03 SESR Master Site List (SESR Form # 7)
5. 2002-03 Master Student List (SESR Form # 8)
6. 2002-03 SESR Facilities Data (SESR Form # 9)
7. 2002-03SESR Policies and Procedures Noncompliant Items worksheet (SESR Form # 10)
8. 2002-03 Educational Benefit Analysis summary form (SESR Form # 11)

DRAFT

Completion of these forms takes the place of all of the print forms/materials except those addressing the following areas (See chart above):

- Site Level Assurances and Information
- District Level Assurances and Information
- District Self-Review Description

Important background and instructions for completing the electronic worksheets are listed by form worksheet, below.

Note: All of these worksheets are contained in a single file. In Excel there are "tabs" at the bottom of the worksheet that show what other worksheets are contained in the file. To move to another worksheet, click on the tab containing the name of the worksheet you wish to use.

B. Master Site List SESR Form Number 7

The purpose of the Master Site List Worksheet is to summarize information about all of the sites that were included in the student record reviews. List information about each site on a separate line. List all of the sites where one or more records were reviewed, including sites that are not operated by the school district.

					No. of Records Reviewed				
Site Name	Site CDS Code	District Name	District Code	Type of Site (HS, Middle, Elem, Alternative, Court School, NPS, Charter School, Other)	High School	Middle School	Elem	Pre School	Infant Toddler

For each site, record the following information:

Site name – Enter the name of the site.

Site CDS code – Enter the seven-digit school code portion of the CDS code. If the site does not have a CDS code (e.g., a Nonpublic School), enter "NA" for not applicable. CDS codes may be found in the California Public School Directory or through the CDE web site http://www.cde.ca.gov/schooldir/.

District Name – Enter the name of the district, county office, nonpublic school, or charter school that administers the site.

District code – Enter the seven-digit school code portion of the CDS code. If the site does not have a CDS code (e.g., a Nonpublic School), enter "NA" for not applicable. CDS codes may be found in the California Public School Directory or through the CDE web site http://www.cde.ca.gov/schooldir/.

Type of Site – Enter the type of school that the site represents – high school, middle school, elementary, alternative, juvenile court school, nonpublic school, charter school, or other.

Number of Records Reviewed – Enter the number of records reviewed for each grade/age grouping included in the worksheet – high school, middle school, elementary, preschool, infant toddler. The sum of the numbers entered in these columns should equal the total number of records reviewed on the site.

C. Master Student List SESR Form Number 8

The purpose of the Master Student List is to summarize information about each of the students reviewed – where they are served, which forms were used to review their records, and information

DRAFT

about the number of findings of noncompliance. All students whose records were reviewed must be included in this table. Information about each student must be recorded on a separate line.

For each student record the following information:

Site Information			Student Information		Age Form Reviewed (1= form used; 0 or blank= form not used)		
District of Service CDS Code	Site Name	Site CDS Code	Student Name	Student Number	Core Review	Data Measure 1	Data Measure 2

Data Measure 4	Data Measure 5	Data Measure 6	Data Measure 7	Data Measure 8	Educational Benefit	Total noncompliant findings	Total N/A	All items Compliant (1= All items compliant

District of Service Name **–** Enter the name of the district, county office, nonpublic school, charter school, etc. that serves the child.

District of Service CDS Code – Enter the seven-digit district code portion of the CDS code that corresponds to the district of service. CDS codes may be found in the California Public School Directory or through the CDE web site http://www.cde.ca.gov/schooldir/.

Site name - Enter the name of the site where the child is served.

Site CDS code – enter the seven-digit school code portion of the CDS code. If the site does not have a CDS code (e.g., a Nonpublic School), enter "NA" for not applicable. CDS codes may be found in the California Public School Directory or through the CDE web site http://www.cde.ca.gov/schooldir/.

Student Name **–** Enter the student's name in the form, "last name, first name" (e.g., Smith, John)

Student Number **–** Enter the student's number as assigned by the district and as reported in California Special Education Management Information System (CASEMIS).

Core Record Review and KPI data measurement used to complete the Monitoring Plan – enter all noncompliant items found

Total Noncompliance Findings – Enter the total number of findings of noncompliance found using the Core Record Review items and any required data measures as indicated in the Monitoring Plan. Thus if there are 10 findings in the Record Review form and 4 findings in data measure item list, enter 14 in this column. If there are no findings of noncompliance enter "0."

Total Not Applicable Findings – Enter the total number of items rated "not applicable" using all items. Thus if there are two items rated not applicable in the Record Review form and 1 in the data measure, enter 3 in this column. If there were no items rated not applicable, enter "0."

All Items Compliant – Enter a "1" if there were no findings of noncompliance for this student. Otherwise, leave this column blank.

California Department of Education
Special Education Division

Coordinated Compliance Review
Special Education Self-Review (SESR)
October 2002

D R A F T

D. Master Noncompliant Findings SESR Form Number 5

The purpose of this table is to capture all findings of noncompliance identified during the review, despite the level (e.g., student, site, district) or the type of review activity (e.g., record review, IEP Implementation, Focus Group, etc.).

District of Service CDS Code	Site CDS Code	Student ID No. (See instructions for entering systemics, focus group and IEP implementation)	Item Number	Noncompliant Finding (Describe)	Corrective Action	Due Date	Evidence to CDE Demonstrating Compliance (attach)	Date Cleared

District of Service CDS Code – Enter the seven-digit district code portion of the CDS code that corresponds to the district of service. CDS codes may be found in the California Public School Directory or through the CDE web site http://www.cde.ca.gov/schooldir/.

Site CDS Code – enter the seven-digit school code portion of the CDS code. If the site does not have a CDS code (e.g., a Nonpublic School), enter "NA" for not applicable. CDS codes may be found in the California Public School Directory or through the CDE web site http://www.cde.ca.gov/schooldir/.

Student ID No. – For findings of noncompliance related to student record reviews, enter the student number as entered in the Master Student List (the student's number as assigned by the district and as reported in CASEMIS). For findings of noncompliance related to IEP implementation enter the student number. For findings of noncompliance resulting from issues raised in the Focus Groups, use 300 as the student number. For district level noncompliance use a student number of 1000. For Site level findings of noncompliance use 500.

Type/Source of Noncompliance	Student ID Number to Use
Student Record Review	Use student's CASEMIS ID No.
IEP Implementation	Use Student's CASEMIS ID No.
Parent Input	Enter 300
Site Systemic Noncompliance	Enter 500
District Systemic Noncompliance	Enter 1000
Educational Benefit (Rowley)	Use student's CASEMIS ID No.

Item Number – Enter the item number (from the student record review form) that corresponds to the item found noncompliant. *For findings of noncompliance related to IEP implementation, always use Item No. 4-1-3 and for noncompliance found during the Educational Benefit review use item number 3-2-3.*

Noncompliant Finding – Enter a statement of what was found/not found in the file that led to the finding of noncompliance. Refer to the narrative for additional guidance regarding findings statements.

Corrective Action – Enter the actions that the district will undertake to correct the finding of noncompliance. All findings of noncompliance must have a corrective action statement. Refer to the narrative for additional guidance regarding findings statements. If the district wishes to use one of the sample corrective actions supplied by CDE, the district can copy and paste that corrective action from the Corrective Action Item Table available at http://www.cde.ca.gov/spbranch/sed/ccr_sr_02/ccrsrdoc.htm .

Due Date – Enter the date by which the corrective action will be accomplished

D R A F T

Evidence to CDE Demonstrating Correction – Enter the evidence that has been (or will be) provided to CDE in response to the corrective action entered for this particular finding of noncompliance. Refer to the narrative for additional guidance regarding evidence of correction.

Date Cleared – Enter the date that the noncompliance was corrected (evidence of correction must be attached). Otherwise, leave blank.

District Name – Enter name of District of Residence

District CDS Code No. – Enter CDS Code for District of Residence

E. IEP Implementation – Services Data SESR Form # 6

The purposes of the IEP Implementation – Services Data table are to: 1) portray the range of supplementary aids and services and related services provided for the students selected for IEP Implementation and 2) identify any instances where services have not been provided as specified in the student's IEP. Each service should be listed on a separate line.

District	District CDS Code No.	Site CDS Code	Related/ Supplementary Aids & Services	No. of Students Whose IEPs Include The Service	No. of Students Who Received the Service as Specified in Their IEP	No. of Students Who Did Not Receive the Service as Specified in Their IEP

District Name – Enter name of District of Residence.

District CDS Code No. – Enter CDS Code for District of Residence.

Site CDS Code No. – Enter the CDS Code for the site.

Related/Supplementary Aids and Services – Enter the name of the service. For assistance refer to the list of Designated Instruction and Services used in the CASEMIS system.

No. of Students Whose IEPs Include the Service – Enter the number of students whose IEPs were reviewed that included the service.

No. of Students Who Received the Service as Specified in Their IEP – Enter the number of students whose IEPs were investigated who received the service as specified in their IEP.

No. of Students Who Did Not Receive the Service as Specified in Their IEP – Enter the number of students whose IEPs were investigated who did not receive the service as specified in their IEP.

F.   SESR Facilities Data SESR Form Number 9

The purpose of the OCR Facilities table is to capture information about each of the classrooms in the district that is used to serve groups of children with disabilities. Note: this table is not intended to capture information about classrooms where children with disabilities are included with nondisabled children.

District Name	District CDS Code	Site Name	Site CDS Code	Room No.	Disability Served	Grade Level of Site (elementary, middle, high school)

District of Service Name – Enter the name of the district, county office, nonpublic school, charter school, etc. that serves the child.

California Department of Education
Special Education Division

Coordinated Compliance Review
Special Education Self-Review (SESR)
October 2002

DRAFT

District of Service CDS Code – Enter the seven-digit district code portion of the CDS code that corresponds to the district of service. CDS codes may be found in the California Public School Directory or through the CDE web site http://www.cde.ca.gov/schooldir/.

Site Name - Enter the name of the site where the child is served.

Site CDS code – enter the seven-digit school code portion of the CDS code. If the site does not have a CDS code (e.g., a Nonpublic School), enter "NA" for not applicable. CDS codes may be found in the California Public School Directory or through the CDE web site http://www.cde.ca.gov/schooldir/.

Room Number – enter the room number of the classroom where the group of children with disabilities is served.

Disability Served **–** enter the category of disability for the group of children served. Use one of the 13 categories found in the California Code of Regulations, Title 5, Section 3030.

Grade Level of Site – enter whether the classroom is located on a site that is and elementary school, middle school, or high school.

Largest No. of Pupils Occupying Classroom for Any One Period of the Day	Classroom Size (sq. ft.)	SELPA-County Office Operated Program	Comments

Largest No. of Pupils Occupying Classroom for Any One Period of the Day - Enter the number of pupils representing the most students with disabilities in the room at the same time during a given day. Thus, if there are 10 students with disabilities in first period and 20 in the second period, enter the number "20."

Classroom Size – Enter the square footage of the classroom.

SELPA-County Operated Program. Enter either "SELPA" or "County", if the classroom is used for a program operated by either the county or the SELPA. Leave blank if the classroom is used by the district of residence.

Comments – Enter any explanatory information about the classroom or the group of students served that may not have been adequately explained by the data entered in any other column.

G. Policies and Procedures SESR Form Number 10

Review District policies and procedures using: 1) The Core Policy and Procedure Review Items form; and Other policy and procedure review forms, based on the SESR Monitoring plan. These forms are structured the same way as the Student Record Review forms and should be completed using the same guidelines.

Record findings of noncompliance in the 2002-03 Master Noncompliant Findings worksheet (SESR form # 5). Policy and Procedure findings are always considered systemic at the district level.

H. Educational Benefit Analysis Summary Form SESR Form 11

Review the Educational Benefit Review Student Summary form (**SESR Form # 3)** you filled out and transfer this information to the ***2002-03 Educational Benefit Analysis form (SESR Form # 11).***
List on the worksheet a "+" if there was growth on the pupil's performance level, goals/objectives, services and, or progress. Place a "–" if there was any regression in any one of the areas or a zero if there is no change.

California Department of Education
Special Education Division

Coordinated Compliance Review
Special Education Self-Review (SESR)
October 2002

DRAFT

District Name	Site CDS Code	Student ID No.	Performance	Goals/ Objectives	Services	Progress

Monitoring the Implementation of the Local Plan (SESR Form # 4)

Find the SESR 2002-03 Monitoring the Implementation of the Local Plan form (**SESR Form # 4)**

1. Attach any agreements made within your SELPA (multiple district SELPAs) that describes how district special education programs will be reviewed for compliance and what mechanisms are in place to correct any problems (EC § 56195.7)

2. Answer question two by describing the process your SELPA uses for monitoring compliance. (Use additional sheets if necessary).

3. Provide evidence of recent monitoring activities your SELPA has completed in your district.

4. If you found any systemic noncompliant items, please explain why the SELPA had not already identified and corrected these items.

5. Have your SELPA provide an explanation as to how it plans to come into compliance with EC § 56195.7.

VIII.   Reporting to CDE

The following items must be submitted to the CDE by July 1, 2003:

1. District Level 2002-03 CCR Self-Review Assurances and information (SESR # 1) (one per district)
2. Site Level CCR Self-Review Assurances and information (SESR # 2) (one per site)
3. Educational Benefit Review Student Summary Form (SESR # 3) (one per student)
4. CDE SESR 2002-03 Monitoring the Implementation of the Local Plan form SESR # 4) (electronic)
5. SESR 2002-03 Master Noncompliant Findings worksheet (SESR #5) (electronic)
6. CCR SESR 2002-03 IEP Services Data worksheet (SESR # 6) (electronic)
7. 2002-03 SESR Master Site List (SESR # 7) (electronic)
8. 2002-03 Master Student List (SESR # 8) (electronic)
9. 2002-03 SESR Facilities Data (SESR # 9) (electronic)
10. 2002-03SESR Policies and Procedures Noncompliant Items worksheet (SESR # 10) (electronic)
11. 2002-03 Educational Benefit Analysis summary form (SESR # 11) (electronic)

IX. Sample Timeline for CCR Self-Review

ACTIVITY	TIMELINE
Attend CCR SR Training	September/October 2002
Conduct Parent Input Activity/get parent and CDE sign off	October/November 2002
Conduct Schedule for Training and Review	November 2002
Conduct Training and Begin Review	November – December 2002 & January 2003

DRAFT

Site Level
- Site Record Reviews
- Complete SESR monitor plan investigation
- Site Data-Facilities
- Develop Summary of All Findings and Corrective Action Plans

District Level
- Complete SESR monitor plan investigation
- IEP Implementation and Service Data
- Aggregate school site facility data (begin)
- Develop Summary of All Findings and Corrective Action Plans

Collection and Analysis of all Data	February-March 2003
Develop proposed Corrective Action Plans	February 2003
Aggregate all school site facility data	March 2003
Discuss Findings and Corrections to school sites, boards, community and other interested parties	April/May 2003
Collect and summarize evidence of Corrective Actions and complete all forms and discs for submission to CDE	June 2003
Submit all required information and discs to CDE, Special Education Division (SED)	By July 1, 2003

Completed copies and discs of each site form and the district level data forms are to be mailed to CDE no later than July 1, 2003. Please provide a copy of the summary to your SELPA administrator.

Mail all documentation to:

California Department of Education
Special Education Division
428 J Street, Second Floor
Sacramento, CA 95814
Attention: Manager, Focused Monitoring Technical Assistance, Region (see below)

Bob Evans, Manager, email: bevans@cde.ca.gov (Region 1)
Ralph Scott, Manager, email rscott@cde.ca.gov (Region 2)
Nancy Remley, Manager, email: nremley@cde.ca.gov (Region 3)
Christine Pittman, Manager, email cpittman@cde.ca.gov (Region 4)
Michael Warych, Manager, email: mwarych@cde.ca.gov (Region 5)

DRAFT

Appendix 1 – Preparing for Student Record Reviews

Preparation for Student Record Reviews

To prepare for the review, the district needs to determine which other LEAs/programs serve children who are residents of the district. These could include other districts in the SELPA, the County Office of Education, juvenile court schools, charter schools and nonpublic schools, etc. The records for district residents served by these other districts and programs must be included in the review.

The district should contact each of these agencies to let them know about the record review process and to initiate record review process planning. In addition, the district should make a list of all of the sites in the district that include students who are receiving special education or related services. The district will be responsible for reviewing student records at all district sites (where there are special education students), and all LEAs, charter schools and Nonpublic Schools where district residents are served. The district may want to establish which records are to be reviewed at each site, or they may want have the record selection made at the site level. In any case, the district will want to make sure that records of children with all disabilities are reviewed.   Some nonpublic schools are scheduled for review by state reviewers during the current year.   The district is not responsible for reviewing records at those NPSs, as state reviewers will be reviewing student records at those schools.

It is important to note that the district may not be aware of infants and toddlers, served by another LEA, COE, regional center or private programs, who are residents of the district. District personnel should contact the appropriate LEA(s) in the SELPA to identify which infants and toddlers will be included in the review

For planning purposes, districts should consider that it will take 1 to 2 days for a team of 3-4 trained persons to do a thorough review of student records at each site.

A. Preparing The District Sites

In order to prepare the district sites for the review, the district should contact each site to confirm their participation, schedule the review, describe the process, solicit the participation of site/district staff, determine a location where the record review will take place and to answer any questions the site/district staff may have.

B.   Selecting Review Team Members

The district should seek to arrange for teams of 3-4 people to conduct the record reviews. Team members should be knowledgeable of the requirements of state and federal laws and regulations related to special education and should have access to copies of the federal IDEA regulations (both Part B and Part C) and the California Special Education Programs Composite of Laws during the reviews. If possible it is important to include parents who have children with disabilities on the team of reviewers and also persons who are knowledgeable about programs for infants and preschoolers. Ideally, districts should ensure that teams are not assigned to sites where one or more of the team members works. If not possible, the district must ensure that reviewers do not review their own student records.   The district may want to use the same team at all sites or have different team members.   It is important that the review team members are knowledgeable about the district's continuum of program options and operational policies of the district.

DRAFT

C. Training

In preparation for the record reviews, district-wide team training should be conducted. The training should address the following topics:

1. Overview of the CCR/SESR
   a. Monitoring Plan
   b. Review Activity
   c. Reporting to CDE
   d. IEP Verification
   e. KPI Query
   f. Facilities Data Collection

2. The Record Review Process
   a. State requirements
   b. Site List and Schedule
   c. Team Selection and Assignment
   d. Contacting the site
   e. General Location, Content and Structure of Records
   f. Selecting the Forms to Use in the Review
   g. Identifying and Recording Compliance and Noncompliance
   h. Summarizing Student Findings
   i. Developing and Implementing student and Systemic Corrective Actions with Appropriate Evidence

3. Sample Record Review (Pull 3-4 records of children of various ages and disabilities to use as training examples
   a. Overview of record structure and contents
   b. Overview of form structure
   c. General rules (e.g., use most recent example of a document – meeting notice, IEP, or always make a notation of why an item was marked noncompliant or not applicable)
   d. Using legal references.
   e. What to do when there is a question
   f. Practice Record Reviews
   g. Questions and Answers

DRAFT

D R A F T

Appendix 2 – District Data Report

A. District Data Report

The CDE through the CASEMIS collects data on individual students with disabilities who are receiving special education and related services in the state. Through the use of this data, districts can provide/identify quality educational programs and improve student outcomes. The Data Report is disseminated to the school districts in a variety of ways. District Special Education Data Reports are available on the SED web site at http://www.cde.ca.gov/spbranch/sed/datarpts/index.htm . These reports are directly connected to the SED Goals, Quality Assurance Process and Focused Monitoring of special education programs.

The CDE, SED, has established five goals, eight KPIs and twelve measures used in selection of districts to be included in the Focused Monitoring. (Summaries of the specific methods used to calculate the measures are described on the CDE website).

The five goals, with the KPI, that support of the CDE, SED are:

Goal 1 All individuals' unique instructional needs will be accurately identified
- ▪ **KPI 2:** Disparity among Ethnic Categories in % of students receiving special education and related services.
- ▪ **KPI 1:** Percent of students receiving special education and related services

Goal 2 All individuals with disabilities will be served or taught by fully qualified personnel
- ▪ **KPI 3**: Percent of students receiving special education and related services who are educated with non-disabled peers 80% or more of the time

Goal 3 All individuals will be successfully integrated with non-disabled peers throughout their educational experiences
- ▪ **KPI 3**: Percent of students receiving special education and related services who are educated with non-disabled peers 80% or more of the time:

Goal 4 All individuals with disabilities will meet high standards for academic and non-academic skills
- ▪ **KPI 7**: Percent of students receiving special education services who took the Stanford 9 (STAR) and scored at or above the 50th percentile
- ▪ **KPI 8**: Mean Scale score of students receiving special education services who took the Stanford 9 (STAR) Reading Exam

Goal 5 All individuals with disabilities will successfully participate in preparation for the workplace and independent living
- ▪ **KPI 4:** Percent of exited students who returned to general education
- ▪ **KPI 5**: Percent of exited students who graduated (grade 12)
- ▪ **KPI 6**: Percent of exited students who dropped out (grades 7-12)

B. Interpreting Data Reports

The Data Reports are based primarily on measures that are included in 8 KPIs and other district data sources from CASEMIS, June/December report, CBEDS prior year and STAR Research Database from prior year. KPIs are measures of progress toward achieving statewide special education goals and are based on compliance, enrollment and performance data. The KPIs are also used to select districts annually to be included in the Focused Monitoring process. Detailed descriptions of the data elements used to calculate the measures and their relationship to KPIs as well as SED goals can be accessed through the link to Calculation Matrix on the SED web site at http://www.cde.ca.gov/spbranch/sed/datarpts/index.htm .

The Special Education Data Reports should **not** be used as the sole measure in determining the quality of a district's special education program. The reports provide information that can be used by

D R A F T

local school officials and others to help them examine their district special education programs and thus focus their efforts in areas most in need of improvement.

The following terms have been used in the Data Report:

- Comparable Districts
  Districts throughout the state were separated into 3 categories/types (Elementary, High School or Unified) and 7 population groupings that generally have the same number of district enrollment. A list of districts in each comparable group is listed on the Website along with a table showing group statistics for each KPI and measure.

- Disparity
  This is the difference between the number of students served with special education and related services, district enrollment and the ethnic categories. The disparity is determined by what percent in each ethnic category receive special education and related services. For example, if there are 100 African American students residing in a district and 16 of these African American students receive special education and related services, then the percent of African American students receiving special education is 16/100 or 16%. Similarly, if there are 285 Asian students in the district and 15 of those students receive special education, then the percentage of Asian students receiving special education in the district is 15/285 or 5.3 %. These percentages are calculated for each ethnic population listed on the Data Report for each specific district.

  In some districts, ethnic category and socioeconomic status are closely related and should be taken into consideration when interpreting the disparity. In small districts, the disparity calculations are small and a zero is indicated

- Licensed Children's Institutions
  When a district has placed students in Licensed Children's Institutions (LCIs), the school district of residence becomes the district in which the LCI is located. LCI placements may affect the proportion of students in one or more of the ethnic categories receiving special education and related services in the district. This may affect the disparity measurement, as the calculations are based on district of residence. The Data Report summaries identify the districts that report students residing in LCIs and that factor should be considered when interpreting the disparity measure.

- Exited
  When a student has left special education services due to graduation, eligibility, dropping out of school, withdrawal by parents, moving or a variety of other reasons they are reported as exited. The KPI measures look only at the students as exited.

- CASEMIS
  California Special Education Management Information System is a database of individual student records provided by the SELPA twice each year to SED in April and December. School district superintendents and the SELPA director certify these reports prior to being submitted to CDE.

- CBEDS
  California Basic Education Data System is an aggregate level database of information provided annually by districts for all students.

- STAR
  Standardized Testing and Reporting (STAR) Program is a system for determining how well students are achieving academically compared to a national sample of students. The program consists of Stanford Achievement Test, ninth edition (SAT 9), California Standards Test (CST) and the Spanish Assessment of Basic Education, second edition

DRAFT

(SABE/2). ~~See CDE web site at http://www.cde.ca.gov/statetests/ for~~ Guidance For ~~Making Accommodation Decisions, January 2002~~

For all KPI measures, a blank indicates there were too few students to calculate a meaningful measure or that the data were not available or submitted for that district. A zero indicates the calculated value for the KPI measure is negligible. For example, a blank Asian category for KPI 2 indicates there were fewer than 20 Asian students in that district. A zero in the same block would indicate none of the 20 or more Asian students in a specific district are receiving special education or related services.

Note: for some districts a special education Data Report may not be posted on the CDE website due to small size and scope of the district. Percentages may not be included on a district Data Report due to a small number of students. If no Data Report is posted, districts may contact the Focused Monitoring Regional Consultant for assistance in obtaining data. The following criteria are used to determine if a data measure must be investigated in the Monitoring Plan.

Item No.	Measure	Criteria for Further Investigation
KPI 1	Percent in SE	Exceeds plus or minus 2% compared to comparable districts
KPI 2	Ethnic Disparity	Exceeds 2% of the average disparity for comparable districts
KPI 3a	Out 20% or less	More than 2% below the average for comparable districts
KPI 3b	Out 80% or more	Exceeds 2% of average for comparable districts
KPI 4	Returned to GE	More than 2% below the average for comparable districts
KPI 5	% Graduated	More than 2% below the average for comparable districts
KPI 6	% Dropped out	Exceeds 2% of the average for comparable districts
KPI 7	Over 50th Percentile	More than 2% below the average for comparable districts.
KPI 8	Star Reading	Below the average scale score for comparable districts

DRAFT

Appendix 3 – Parent Input

A. Parent Input: Focus Group

Parent/guardian Focus Groups are one activity used by the CDE when reviewing local school districts to ensure compliance with the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) and accompanying state and federal laws and regulations.

- ✓ It is designed to gather information on the strengths and weaknesses of the district's special education program for both compliance and educational benefit for students with disabilities.
- ✓ It is designed to assist the district in determining areas for compliance correction and general areas for improvement.
- ✓ It verifies information obtained from other sources;
- ✓ It collects information not available through other sources;
- ✓ It resolves discrepancies among information sources;
- ✓ It provides insight into understanding the internal dynamics of program operation;
- ✓ It identifies activities that are occurring that are not evident with qualitative measures, and
- ✓ It identifies issues that need to be investigated further.

Conducting a Focus Group

- ✓ The district selected moderator provides the pacing and timing using the previously selected questions provided by the CDE. The district administrator welcomes parents/guardians at the beginning of the session, explains the focus group purpose, process and outcomes and introduces the moderator. The district records responses from the parents/guardians using the CDE developed protocol, (CCRSESR Note-taking form)

Choosing Focus Group Participants

- ✓ Choose parents/guardians who are willing to speak openly and frankly.
- ✓ It is recommended that you do not choose individuals who are district employees.
- ✓ Choose participants that reflect your service delivery system.
- ✓ Limit focus group size to approximately 15 participants. Due to potential participants' busy schedules, you should consider inviting more than 15 parents/guardians in order to actually have 15 members in attendance. The minimum number of required participants for a focus group would be 10 parent participants.
- ✓ Select participants using your district management information system (MIS) by randomizing selection (example: every 5th, 8th, 16th, 45th, 65th, 85th, etc.)   Consult with your data evaluation personnel (or county office personnel) to determine the appropriate randomization selection formula for your district.
- ✓ If the district has home language surveys that indicate that 25% of their special education population has a designated language other than English, the district shall conduct a focus group with interpreters for just than language group as well as another focus group for English speakers.

Choosing a Moderator

- ✓ Select a moderator who has experience and skills in running small informal focus groups. A district might want to contact their SELPA for assistance or a PTI Center in their region for assistance in selecting a moderator. Go to the SED web site at http://www.cde.ca.gov/spbranch/sed/caprntorg.htm for a listing of PTIs statewide. The district may want to ask a local site administrator or community member skilled in facilitation and small group process to be the moderator. Another option might be to ask their local Community Advisory Committee representative to conduct the focus group.

DRAFT

✓ The moderator should to be neutral and have no conflict of interest.
✓ Prior to the focus group carefully plan with the moderator.
✓ The moderator's job is not to entertain but to engage the group in a process that answers questions, gathers information and reaches the focus group outcome.
✓ It is very important for the District Administrator responsible for special education programs and services to be at the Focus Group session. The administrator will hear and observe firsthand what is working well and what could be improved in the special education programs versus getting the information second hand. A good rule to use is for the administrator to simply listen to concerns and not be there to answer specific questions about the district's operation.

Ensuring a Successful Outcome

✓ If possible, provide refreshments for your visitors. Welcome them and create an informal and positive interaction from the start. Some districts provide childcare to optimize parent participation.
✓ Remember that a focus group is not a public input meeting. Do not flood the meeting with your staff or outside public. This would be intimidating and not useful to your data gathering.
✓ As suggested by parents to the CDE, the moderator may want to post the focus group questions on chart paper, or use overheads to guide the group. Overheads containing background information are provided for each question area.

Choosing as Successful Room Arrangement

✓ A "horseshoe" arrangement of table and chairs for parents and guardians is recommended.
✓ The moderator needs a table for an overhead projector and screen
✓ Separate tables are needed for individuals taking notes and located close enough to hear but not to distract.

General Agenda for the Focus Group

✓ Welcome, Purpose, Process and Outcomes: Open the meeting by thanking people for their attendance. Clearly state the reason for the meeting and the process to be used. Tell the group you are seeking answers and understanding around specific topics. Tell the group the expected outcomes and how the information will be used.
✓ Introductions: Introduce the moderator, notetaker(s), any others and explain roles. Have each of the participants introduce themselves and describe where their child goes to school.
✓ Focus Group Questions and Discussion: Begin the focus group questions and probes (provided by CDE) with planned timed for each. Listen and record all responses provided. There are special note-taking forms that may be useful for staff to use when recording participant responses.
✓ Close the focus group by thanking them for participating. Let them know their comments are taken seriously and how they will be used.
✓ Debriefing: Ask parents if they would remain for a few minutes to talk about the process of the Focus Group with you. Use the CDE provided questions (CCR SR Focus Group Parent Debriefing) to debrief with your parents. This will provide you with valuable information about the success of the focus group and changes that you may want to make in the future. The information is also required when you submit your self-review results to the CDE.

DRAFT

Recording The Focus Group Discussion

✓ Arrangements should be made to have staff taking notes during the focus group discussions. While it is desirable to take notes that are as complete as possible, it is important to remind notetakers to listen for the key themes of compliance, strengths and needs. Staff notes can be augmented by an audio recording (with participant knowledge and consent) to ensure a comprehensive record of the proceedings.

Samples of invitations, flyers, etc. are available on the SED web site at http://www.cde.ca.gov/spbranch/sed/ccr_sr_02/ccrsrdoc.htm

Note: All areas of concern/noncompliance will be reviewed and addressed in the district's monitoring plan that is developed with district staff and a parent professional team.

B. Parent Input: Guardian Input Meeting

Usefulness of parent sessions

✓ Verify information obtained from other sources
✓ Collect information not available through other sources
✓ Resolve discrepancies among information sources
✓ Provides insight into understanding the internal dynamics of program operation
✓ Can identify activities that are occurring that are not evident with qualitative measures

Content and Design of Input Session

✓ Input sessions are specifically developed to address specific areas about the development, implementation, access, and outcomes of student's with disabilities individualized education program (IEP) and general compliance with federal and state laws and regulations (IDEA)
✓ The input sessions are designed to gather compliance information and gain perspective of those individuals directly involved in the special education programs regarding their perceptions, feelings, and knowledge of the programs being reviewed.

Input Session Methods

✓ The input session methods are qualitative in nature and descriptive with parents/guardians providing information important to them.
✓ The process is designed to allow for any parent in the district to provide information about the district's special education programs and services.
✓ In the event that parents of students from other districts attend the parent input session, it is important at the outset of the meeting to have parents identify the schools, on the sign in sheet, their children attend. It is important that information provided is relevant only to the district being reviewed.
✓ The input session flier requests, but does not limit, information on targeted key areas of IDEA, including OSEP identified areas of noncompliance found in California. (See CDE Questions and Probes)

How Will the Parent/Guardian Input Session be Conducted?

CDE provides a sample flier to the district to complete and provide to parents of students with disabilities in the district. The district is responsible for: obtaining a safe and accessible facility, providing needed accommodations, translators, interpreters, equipment (podium, microphone) and staff to assist in sign in. The use of a simultaneous translation system for individuals who do not speak English is strongly recommended as it facilitates a more timely and efficient access to information for all participants. The session is held for two hours (generally 7:00 P.M. to 9:00 P.M.). A parent of a child with disabilities moderates the parent input session. A neutral facilitator keeps

California Department of Education
Special Education Division

Coordinated Compliance Review
Special Education Self-Review (SESR)
October 2002

DRAFT

the process focused and lets the group know when it's time for another speaker or topic. The parent moderator will advise the parents from other school districts that they may write comments about their school concerns on the cards provided.

The district administrator welcomes parents/guardians at the beginning of the session. The district will provide a list of the schools in the district so that the parents will be familiar with the district as a whole. The district staff closes the input session, collects the sign-in sheet and written input and conducts a debriefing with the moderator regarding the content heard during the input session.

Recording Results

District staff are urged to take careful notes and to mark "red flags" for compliance issues. Verbal input alone is not sufficient to establish noncompliance. Further corroboration is needed.

Post review meeting: Discuss the "red flags" from the parent input session and compare with other elements of the review. If the team, including the lead consultant, identifies evidence of noncompliance from the parent input session that is corroborated elsewhere, a systemic finding will occur.

Parent/Guardian Input Meeting Materials

Materials may be located at http://www.cde.ca.gov/spbranch/sed/ccr_sr_02/ccrsrdoc.htm

- ✓ Check List
- ✓ Invitation
- ✓ Sign In Sheet
- ✓ Note taking forms
- ✓ Parent Questionnaire
- ✓ Debriefing Questions for Parents

C. Parent Input: Survey

A parent survey is a written instrument sent to all parents in the district that requests input on specific questions.

The purpose of the questions is to focus on most frequent concerns found during interviews conducted by the SEEDS staff for the past two years. The SEEDS staff also compared the frequency of concerns to the most frequent findings of noncompliance found in the CDE review process.

The list of questions provided by CDE has been crafted with probes that would most effectively draw out information in the "focus" areas.

If surveys are used, CDE requires that at least 20% of families of students enrolled in the district's special education programs be returned for review.

Any common areas of concern raised by parents in the surveys should be noted in the district's monitoring plan for future follow up SESR form # 12).